```
OBMKCOL1
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                 V.
                                                24 CR 00367 (LJL)
 5
      HECTOR COLON,
 6
                                                Trial
                     Defendant.
7
 8
                                                New York, N.Y.
 9
                                                November 22, 2024
                                                9:00 a.m.
10
11
      Before:
12
                            HON. LEWIS J. LIMAN,
13
                                                District Judge
                                                 -And A Jury-
14
                                 APPEARANCES
15
      DAMIAN WILLIAMS
16
           United States Attorney for the
           Southern District of New York
17
      JACOB FIDDELMAN
      JANE KIM
18
      CATHERINE E. GHOSH
           Assistant United States Attorneys
19
      THOMAS AMBROSIO, ESQ.
20
          Attorney for Defendant
      BY: THOMAS AMBROSIO
21
      Also Present:
22
      Jayda Foote, USAO Paralegal
23
      Shirel Garzon, USAO Paralegal
      Preston Gover, Defense Paralegal
2.4
25
```

(Trial resumed; in open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Mr. Ambrosio, are you still reading the proposed supplemental charge?

MR. AMBROSIO: I just finished it, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

I want to thank the parties for their letters of last night. I've distributed a proposed supplemental charge. Let me tell you what I've done and then what my thoughts are, and then I'll invite views.

I adopted points 1 and 2 of the government's supplemental charge as Mr. Ambrosio described them in his letter to me, with one exception, which is that, as Mr. Ambrosio suggested, I substituted the word "admitted" for the word "advanced" with respect to what it is that the jury should consider in terms of evidence in the case.

What Mr. Ambrosio characterized as point 3 was the language that the government had proposed which would invite the jury to send me a note if there was a juror who was failing to follow my instructions. For reasons that I will explain, I generally agreed with Mr. Ambrosio's views that it was premature, at this point, to extend such an introduction.

I added to my proposed charge some language that softly is intended to suggest that if the jury had a question about whether a juror was not following my instructions, they could send me a note. It's a very, very, very soft suggestion.

The language is: "If these instructions should fail to address your concerns." That doesn't purport to characterize their concerns as to whether they pertain to a juror who's not following my instructions or pertain to something different.

I should give you the reason why I am not adopting the government's proposal, at least at this stage.

I've reviewed the *Avenatti* case, from which the Government drew its proposed language. In that case, the note from the jury went much further, in suggesting that there was a juror who was not following the evidence. In this case, the note, as I read it, is ambiguous, and I think it's too early to extend an invitation to the jury that is any more explicit than what I've drafted.

There are all kinds of ways in which one can read the note that we got from the jury. One way one could read it is that there is one or more jurors who are motivated by bias and not following my instructions. It's conceivable that that's what's happening.

It is also conceivable that what's happening is that there is a juror who, in the view of the majority of the jurors, is not convinced by the evidence, and that the majority of the jurors believe that that juror is motivated by some form of bias, but that's the view of the majority of the jurors; it doesn't yet suggest that the one or more than one juror who doesn't believe the evidence has that belief because of

impermissible bias or simply a view that the evidence doesn't establish the proposition that the majority of the jurors believes that it supports.

With that extended explanation, does the government have any views with respect to my supplemental instruction?

MR. FIDDELMAN: We're fine with it. We understand the Court's reasoning, and we defer to the Court's discretion here.

We provided some case law at the front of our letter, not because we think we're there yet, but just to get everyone, I guess, on the same page.

We agree that the note is ambiguous. And we should put on the record that the parties were discussing last night, and again this morning, that the note doesn't tell us really anything about which way any biases might be pointing, what type of bias they might be referring to. There are all sorts of types of biases that could be impermissible, but they aren't necessarily of any one type, and they also aren't necessarily, as the Court said, in fact biases. And particularly because, at this stage, not enough has been identified, we tried to just propose instructions rather than inquiries.

So we're fine with the Court's proposal.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Fiddelman, I should say that identifying those cases for me was extremely helpful, and I spent some time last night reviewing the cases — including Thomas, including Baker, including the progeny of those two

cases - alerted to the sensitivity of the issue.

Anything from the defense on the proposed supplemental charge?

MR. AMBROSIO: Your Honor, I think your supplemental charge is appropriate, and I take no exceptions to it.

THE COURT: So, when we've got a full jury, we'll bring them in, and I will deliver to them the supplemental charge.

We've got copies of the supplemental charge for them to follow along with, so we'll distribute those, and then they will have those to bring back into the jury room. And we'll see what the day brings.

We'll see you all back here around 9:30.

(Recess)

THE COURT: I should mention that when my deputy went into the jury room just to make sure that all of the jurors were there, one of the jurors asked him, "Can we ask the judge questions?" And his response to them was, "Through sending a note out to the judge."

So, when I get to the point of the supplemental charge, where I say, "If you have any additional questions or concerns, you can always send me another note," I think I will add language that's not in this script but that will say, you know, "through your foreperson in the manner that I've previously described."

Let's bring the jury in.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Be seated.

Good morning, members of the jury. I hope you all had a pleasant evening.

My law clerk will now distribute to you a supplemental charge that we've prepared.

(Pause)

THE COURT: I have received your note, which reads as follows: "Can we have a moment to discuss more about what reasonable doubt should be from the judge? We are having a lot of discord. Some are more driven by bias and don't believe some items."

At the beginning of this case, you each took an oath to well and truly try this issue and give a true verdict according to the law and the evidence.

Pursuant to that oath, each of you has a duty to deliberate. That entails a duty to consult with one another, to consider each other's views with an open mind, and to discuss the evidence with the objective of reaching a just verdict, if you can do so.

Under your oath as jurors, you are not to be swayed by sympathy or emotion. You should be guided solely by the evidence presented during the trial and the law as I gave it to you, without regard to the consequences of your decision.

You have been chosen to try the issues of fact and reach a verdict on the basis of the evidence or lack of evidence. Your verdict must be based solely upon the evidence admitted at trial, or the lack of evidence, but I remind you that the defendant has no burden to present any evidence. As I've told you many times, the burden of proof lies solely with the government.

It would be improper for you to consider, in reaching your decision as to whether the government has sustained its burden of proof, any personal feelings you may have about the defendant's race, religion, national origin, sex, age, or political views. Similarly, it would be improper for you to consider any personal feelings you may have about the race, religion, national origin, sex, age, or political views of any witness, or anyone else involved in the case.

Do not allow yourself to be influenced by personal likes or dislikes, sympathy, prejudice, fear, stereotypes, public opinion, or biases, including unconscious biases.

Unconscious biases are stereotypes, attitudes, or preferences that people may consciously reject but may be expressed without conscious awareness, control, or intention. Like conscious bias, unconscious bias can affect how we evaluate information and make decisions.

Both the defendant and the government are entitled to a trial free from prejudice, and our judicial system cannot

2.4

work unless you reach your verdict through a fair and impartial consideration of the evidence. To repeat, your verdict must be based exclusively upon the evidence or lack of evidence in this case.

You've asked me about reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based in reason and arising out of the evidence in the case or the lack of evidence. It is a doubt that a reasonable person has after carefully weighing all of the evidence in the case. Reasonable doubt is a doubt that appeals to your reason, your judgment, your experience, and your common sense. Reasonable doubt is not whim or speculation. It is not an excuse to avoid an unpleasant duty. Nor is it sympathy for the defendant or any party. A doubt based on any of the impermissible considerations I've just outlined for you is not a reasonable doubt.

Similarly, a guilty verdict cannot be based on any of these impermissible considerations.

"Beyond a reasonable doubt" does not mean mathematical certainty or proof beyond all possible doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt. It is practically impossible for a person to be absolutely and completely convinced of any disputed fact that by its very nature cannot be proven with mathematical certainty.

The government's burden is to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, not all possible doubt. The law in a

criminal case is that it is sufficient if the guilt of the defendant is established beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all possible doubt. Therefore, if after a fair and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you can candidly and honestly say that you do have an abiding belief of the defendant's guilt, such a belief as a prudent person would be willing to act upon in important matters in the personal affairs of his or her own life, then you have no reasonable doubt, and, under such circumstances, it is your duty to convict the defendant of the particular crime in question.

On the other hand, if, after a fair and impartial consideration of all of the evidence, you can candidly and honestly say that you are not satisfied with the defendant's guilt as to any charge, that you do not have an abiding belief of his guilt as to that charge — in other words, if you have such a doubt as would reasonably cause a prudent person to hesitate in acting in matters of importance in his or her own affairs — then you have a reasonable doubt, and, in that circumstance, it is your duty to acquit the defendant of that charge.

Now, I say this not because I think it is necessary, but I remind you to be polite and respectful to each other, as I'm sure you will be in the course of your deliberations, so that each juror may have his or her position made clear to all the others. I remind you once again that your oath is to

decide without fear or favor and to decide the issues based solely on the evidence and on my instructions on the law.

I remind you that your verdict must be unanimous.

Further, you are reminded that if at any time you are not in agreement, you are not to reveal the positions of the jurors, including a split of the vote, to anyone, including to me, at any time during your deliberations.

With that, I will ask you to return to the jury room to continue your deliberations.

I'm going to give you copies of the instructions I've just read to you and of the instructions I gave to you yesterday. If these instructions fail to address your concerns, or if at any point in your deliberations you have any additional questions or concerns, you can always send me another note through your foreperson, in the manner that I have previously described to you.

So, you're now to return to the jury room to continue your deliberations. Thank you.

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: Okay. Everybody, stay nearby. We'll see what the day brings.

(Recess pending verdict)

THE COURT: All right. We've got another note from the jury. My deputy has marked it as Court Exhibit No. 7.

It's timestamped 12:05 p.m. It was received by us at 12:12.

It reads as follows: "One of the jurors has researched the lawyers online, and it has been brought to our attention. What do we do next?"

If you all want to inspect the note, you're welcome to. I will tell you my initial views are that I should send a note back to the jury indicating that I would like to speak to that juror, and that I need to do an interview of the juror, I presume with counsel present, to understand what it is that the juror researched. At a minimum, I think I would need to do that, and then perhaps get some sense as to what's been shared with the remainder of the jury.

But does the government have a view right now, or does the government want to spend some time thinking about it?

What's your preference, Mr. Fiddelman?

MR. FIDDELMAN: We'd ask for perhaps a five- or ten-minute recess just to think and consult, but sort of our initial reaction is that what your Honor described sounds right but we would appreciate a little bit of time.

THE COURT: That's fine with me.

Mr. Ambrosio?

MR. AMBROSIO: I agree with what Mr. Fiddelman just said. I agree that your Honor's suggestion might be the appropriate way to go, at a minimum. I would like a little time, too, to see if I could do some research on that, as well.

THE COURT: Do either of you have a view as to the

form in which I would request the interview?

One thing that I could do is prepare a note to send back, saying, in essence, I would like to speak to the juror in question, and ask that juror to come into the courtroom. That way, it's all in writing.

MR. FIDDELMAN: I think that makes sense, your Honor. To bring the entire jury into the courtroom to say that, and send them all back, and then one come back out, seems an unnecessary step.

THE COURT: Mr. Ambrosio?

MR. AMBROSIO: I agree with that, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, we'll prepare that note. I'm not going to do anything, obviously, until you all have time to think about next steps.

Let's try to be back here at 12:40, which is the ten minutes. If it turns out you need a couple of extra minutes, then that's also fine with me.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Thank you.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Mr. Fiddelman?

MR. FIDDELMAN: Thank you for those few minutes, your Honor.

In short, I think the parties are in agreement that your Honor's proposal is the way to go.

As an initial step, I think everyone needs to know a

little bit more because it could be something innocuous, where the juror might confirm, "I did that, I'm sorry, I shouldn't have done it but I'm going to put it out of my mind and it will not affect anything," in which case it's possible all parties would be prepared for the jury to continue; it could be something more problematic. And, in all events, we need to know not just what the juror researched but what subset of that information was shared with the rest of the jury. And you could see certain highly problematic results here, and I don't mean to hypothesize, but, for example, if one of the jurors researched me or Ms. Ghosh, they could have found press releases about the 70-defendant takedown in this case, which could have mentioned the number of defendants who have pleaded guilty, and then if any of that information has been learned by a juror, we have a more serious problem.

So, we just need to know more. And, obviously, I'm sure the Court is quite attuned to this, but we think that sort of as a first step, it should just be information-gathering and not any necessarily follow-up questions about whether it has affected the jurors' deliberations or how, and we'd ask for an opportunity to chat with your Honor once we learn more facts, before next steps are formulated.

THE COURT: I agree with all of that.

Mr. Ambrosio, I'm going to turn to you in just a moment -- well, let me ask you right now, Mr. Ambrosio: I take

```
1
      it you agree that I should interview the juror in question?
 2
               MR. AMBROSIO: Yes, I do, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Okay.
 3
 4
               I would do that in the robing room - I think it's more
 5
      informal - unless the parties wanted me to do it elsewhere.
               Counsel will be present, so I think it would be
 6
7
      probably less imposing on the juror if it's only one lawyer for
      the government, but if the government feels it necessary for
8
 9
      all four people at counsel table to be there, I'm not going to
10
      impose limits.
11
               Mr. Ambrosio, you'll be there. I don't know whether
12
      you want your client to be there?
13
               MR. AMBROSIO: No, Judge. I'd prefer to be alone.
14
               THE COURT: Okay.
15
               And, Mr. Fiddelman, do you need everybody at counsel
16
      table?
17
               MR. FIDDELMAN: Just a moment, your Honor.
18
               (Pause)
19
               MR. FIDDELMAN: I think we'd ask that the three AUSAs,
20
      the three counsel, attend. With due respect to Ms. Garzon, I
21
      think she can skip that part.
22
               THE COURT: I did say that while I prefer one, I would
23
      not limit the government, so that will be fine.
24
               On the note that I send, because I do think I should
25
      send a note back there, which my deputy will essentially read
```

2.4

from when he goes out and pulls the juror, we haven't typed it up yet, we didn't really have time, and I don't think I need to spend the time typing it up unless somebody wants me to -- we may have another note. It looks like the court security officer has an envelope.

Let's see what that is before I speak more.

(Pause)

THE COURT: It's marked as Court Exhibit No. 8, timestamped 12:41, received at 12:42.

It reads: "Can we get the transcript from Hector's testimony when he was questioned about Harry providing bribes?

Can we get the transcript from Harry's testimony about Hector's demands?"

That may be a little bit more straightforward. The parties will confer about the relevant portions of the transcript.

With respect to Note No. 7, what I propose to write to the jury is along the lines of: "The Court has been informed that one of the jurors may have researched the lawyers in the case. The Court would like to speak to that juror. The jurors should stop the deliberations until the juror returns and all jurors are present."

Any objection to that, Mr. Fiddelman?

MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Ambrosio?

642

25

1 MR. AMBROSIO: No, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Let me write it out. 3 (Pause) 4 THE COURT: My deputy actually is going to try to type 5 it up. 6 While he's doing that, I would appreciate thoughts 7 that, first, the government has and then Mr. Ambrosio has about 8 the questioning. I would think it's going to be pretty 9 straightforward to just ask the juror and question what it is 10 that the juror looked at, when the juror looked at it, what the 11 juror remembers seeing, and then what the juror has mentioned 12 to the other jurors about what the juror researched. 13 Anything more, Mr. Fiddelman? 14 MR. FIDDELMAN: No. That sounds right to us, your 15 And there may be more follow-up questions about whether 16 the juror can put things out of his or her mind. And before we 17 get there, we can all reconvene. 18 THE COURT: What I would do is, after I'm done with 19 the questions, I would then ask the juror to step outside of 20 the robing room, and I'll talk to the parties about follow-up 21 questions. 22 Mr. Ambrosio? 23 MR. AMBROSIO: Yes, Judge, I agree. I think your 24 approach is the proper approach for this juror questioning.

THE COURT:

Okay.

25

1 I don't think I need to stay on the bench while my 2 deputy is typing up my note. 3 You all should stay here and look at the note that he is going to be reading from, which he'll mark as Court Exhibit 4 5 No. 9. And then when the juror is ready, my deputy will tell 6 all of you to come into the robing room. Once you're in the 7 robing room, we'll bring the juror in. 8 (Pause) 9 (In the robing room; juror present) 10 THE LAW CLERK: Mr. Morris. 11 THE COURT: Come in, come in. First of all, I want to severely apologize. 12 13 feel horrible about this. 14 THE COURT: No, no, have a seat. 15 So, tell me what you researched. 16 JUROR: I wouldn't call it research. You know, I am 17 in sales. I spend my life on LinkedIn. That's what I do when 18 I encounter people in a professional manner, I tend to look at 19 them on LinkedIn. And I have to admit I did. 20 THE COURT: So, who did you look up? 21 I think -- I know I looked up you. 22 And I think you didn't have one. 23 THE COURT: So, Mr. Fiddelman? 2.4 And I think Mr. Ambrosio. And I -- that might JUROR:

have been it. It was the first day. I don't honestly

1 remember. 2 THE COURT: And what did you see about Mr. Fiddelman 3 on LinkedIn? 4 University of Pennsylvania -- I think? 5 THE COURT: I'm not going to let him respond. Okay. That's what I remember. 6 JUROR: 7 THE COURT: Where he went to school? JUROR: Yeah. 8 9 THE COURT: Did you see anything about his cases that he did? 10 11 No, no. I looked up nothing about the case, nothing about any cases, nothing about other cases. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 Do you remember seeing anything about Mr. Ambrosio? 15 I don't believe he even had an account, if I 16 recall correctly. 17 THE COURT: And Ms. Kim, did you look up anything 18 about her? 19 JUROR: I don't remember. I don't remember doing it, 20 and I think I probably would remember, but I can't quarantee 21 that I didn't. 22 THE COURT: And Ms. Ghosh, do you remember? 23 JUROR: I don't think I did. I just looked up the names -- I didn't have the paper, so I only remembered -- I 24 25 think I remembered your name, and your name, and that was it.

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 What, if anything, did you share with the other jurors 3 about what you had seen? Nothing, absolutely nothing. 4 JUROR: 5 THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask you to step outside just for one moment. Thank you for sharing that. 6 7 JUROR: Yeah. 8 (Juror not present) 9 THE COURT: Let me turn to you first, Mr. Ambrosio. 10 Any follow-up questions you want me to ask? 11 MR. AMBROSIO: I don't think so, your Honor. For the 12 record, I don't have -- if I have a LinkedIn account, I don't 13 even know how to get on it. I have not used it -- I may have 14 had one 20 years ago. I do not use that platform, and if 15 there's anything on there, I don't know what there would be. 16 don't think my photo is on it. 17 So, for me, there's nothing that he could have 18 obtained. 19 THE COURT: And I take it no follow-up questions to 20 ask? 21 MR. AMBROSIO: No. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Fiddelman, do you have a LinkedIn 23 account? 24 MR. FIDDELMAN: I do, your Honor, although the photo 25 is probably from 15 years ago.

1 THE COURT: And do you have a connection with the 2 University of Pennsylvania? 3 MR. FIDDELMAN: That's my undergrad institution. 4 don't have any follow-up questions. 5 THE COURT: Okay. MR. AMBROSIO: Oh, Judge, I do have a follow-up, 6 7 potential follow-up, question. 8 THE COURT: For the juror? 9 MR. AMBROSIO: I'm curious, like, was it just the 10 other jurors felt an obligation to report this? 11 MR. FIDDELMAN: We would object. 12 THE COURT: I'm not inclined to ask -- well, let me 13 ask Mr. Fiddelman first what his position is. 14 MR. FIDDELMAN: We would object to any further 15 questioning about why things were brought to your Honor's 16 attention, because that starts to intrude upon the 17 deliberations. 18 MR. AMBROSIO: Okay. 19 THE COURT: Are you okay with that? 20 MR. AMBROSIO: I'm okay with that, Judge, yes. 21 MR. FIDDELMAN: I guess in terms of follow-up 22 questions, it's not factual follow-up questions, but we do have 23 a suggestion for how to move forward. 2.4 THE COURT: Why don't you make that. 25 MR. FIDDELMAN: We think that this does fall into the

category of potentially minor enough that you can instruct the juror to set anything that he learned aside, and you can ask the juror whether he can fairly and impartially decide the case based solely on the evidence and the law without consideration of anything he saw on LinkedIn. We think if he answers unequivocally yes, there is no issue, and he can return to the jury and continue deliberating.

MR. AMBROSIO: I don't object to that being a follow-up question, Judge. And I would agree that if he answers that it wouldn't affect his ability to continue deliberating fairly and impartially, then he could be excused and they resume their deliberations.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I'm going to do is go through that colloquy with him. You'll all hear his answers, he'll step out again. If the answers are as Mr. Fiddelman has said they might be, then -- either way, we'll have him come back in, and one possible resolution is that I will thank him for bringing the information to my attention, and instruct him to return to the jury room, and the jury, once he returns, can continue deliberating.

Let's bring him back in.

(Juror present)

THE COURT: Let me just ask you a few questions, Mr. Morris.

JUROR: Sure.

1 THE COURT: Do you believe that you would be able to, 2 if you went back into the jury room, set aside, during the 3 deliberations, anything that you saw about the lawyers? I do. 4 JUROR: 5 THE COURT: And do you think that you could fairly and impartially try, decide, this case --6 7 JUROR: I do. 8 THE COURT: -- render a verdict based solely on the 9 evidence and my instructions on the law? 10 I'm very confident in that. There was nothing I saw that would have affected it in any way, and I looked up 11 12 nothing about the case or anything like that. So I'm very confident --13 14 THE COURT: So no doubt that I could decide this case 15 solely on the evidence and my instructions on the law? 16 JUROR: Not in the least. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Let me just ask you to step out for 18 one more moment. 19 (Jury not present) 20 THE COURT: Mr. Ambrosio, any objection to me thanking 21 him, and then instructing him to return to the jury room, and 22 that the jury can continue deliberating? 23 MR. AMBROSIO: No. 2.4 THE COURT: From the government? 25 No objection, your Honor. MR. FIDDELMAN:

1 THE COURT: Okay. Let's have him back in. 2 (Juror present) 3 THE COURT: Mr. Morris, I apologize for making you come back in and leave. 4 5 JUROR: No, this is completely my fault, so I don't mind. 6 7 THE COURT: I want to thank you for bringing this to my attention. 8 9 What I'm going to ask you to do is to return to the 10 jury room and continue your deliberations. Once all of you are back in the jury room, you can continue your deliberations. 11 12 JUROR: Okay, okay. Thank you. And, again, I 13 apologize, and --14 THE COURT: Thank you for bringing it to our 15 attention. 16 JUROR: I'm sorry. Thank you. I apologize to 17 everybody. 18 (Juror not present) 19 THE COURT: While we are still here, do you want some 20 time to go through the transcript and figure out what we're 21 going to read back to the jury? 22 MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor. And we defer to the Court's preference on whether to do readback or just send a 23 24 written copy of the relevant section back into the jury room. I've had experiences both ways, and I don't think we have a 25

It's

24

25

1 preference. 2 Do you have a preference, Mr. Ambrosio? THE COURT: 3 MR. AMBROSIO: I don't, Judge. I usually defer to the 4 Court if you have -- I don't know what your current practice 5 is. 6 MR. FIDDELMAN: The testimony could be long because 7 they asked for Harjeet Singh's testimony about the defendant, which is going to go on for quite a while. 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. So, I think if it is long, my 10 inclination would be just to send it back to the jury so that 11 we don't have to all sit through it. 12 If you are all in agreement as to that, and in 13 agreement as to what should go back to the jury, then you'll 14 let my deputy know what should go back to the jury, he'll mark 15 it as an exhibit, and I don't think I need to come back on the 16 bench, but I defer to all of you with respect to that. If 17 there are disagreements, then I'll resolve them. 18 Any problem with that, Mr. Fiddelman? 19 MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Ambrosio? 21 MR. AMBROSIO: No, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 23 (Recess pending verdict)

It's Court Exhibit No. 12. It's timestamped 2:32 p.m.

THE COURT: Okay. We've got a note from the jury.

```
received at 2:34 p.m. It reads: "We have reached a verdict."
1
 2
               Any reason I should not bring the jury in, from the
 3
      government's perspective?
 4
               MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor.
 5
               And just for the record, were the transcripts that
      were sent back Court Exhibits 10 and 11?
 6
7
               THE COURT: Yes, they were.
8
               MR. FIDDELMAN:
                              Thank you.
 9
               MR. AMBROSIO: No, no reason, Judge.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. Let's bring in the jury.
11
               (Jury present)
                          Juror No. 9, you're the foreperson?
12
               THE COURT:
13
               THE FOREPERSON:
                               Yes.
14
               THE COURT: Have you reached a verdict?
15
               THE FOREPERSON: We have.
16
               THE COURT: Would you please hand your verdict
17
      envelope to my courtroom deputy, Mr. Fishman, for me to
18
      inspect.
19
               Mr. Fishman, I'm going to hand you the verdict
20
      envelope, and I will ask you to hand it to the foreperson, and
21
      then to please take the verdict.
22
               And let me ask the defendant to please rise and face
23
      the jury.
2.4
               Mr. Fishman, would you please now take the verdict.
25
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Count One, solicitation or
```

```
1
      acceptance of a bribe by an agent of an organization receiving
 2
      federal funds, how do you find the defendant, Hector Colon,
 3
      with respect to Count One, not guilty or guilty?
 4
               THE FOREPERSON:
                               Guilty.
 5
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Count Two, extortion under color of
 6
      official right, how do you find the defendant, Hector Colon,
7
      with respect to Count Two, not guilty or guilty?
8
               THE FOREPERSON: Guilty.
 9
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Okay.
10
               THE COURT: Mr. Fishman, you may now collect the
      verdict form.
11
12
               And, Mr. Colon, you may be seated.
13
               Is there a request for a poll?
14
               MR. AMBROSIO: Yes, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Fishman, would you please poll the
16
      jury.
17
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 1, is this your verdict?
18
               JUROR:
                      Yes.
19
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 2, is this your verdict?
20
               JUROR:
                      Yes.
21
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 3, is this your verdict?
22
               JUROR:
                      Yes.
2.3
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 4, is this your verdict?
2.4
               JUROR:
                      Yes.
25
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 5, is this your verdict?
```

1	JUROR: Yes.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 6, is this your verdict?
3	JUROR: Yes.
4	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 7, is this your verdict?
5	JUROR: Yes.
6	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 8, is this your verdict?
7	JUROR: Yes.
8	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 9, is this your verdict?
9	JUROR: Yes.
10	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 10, is this your verdict?
11	JUROR: Yes.
12	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 11, is this your verdict?
13	JUROR: Yes.
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror No. 12, is this your verdict?
15	JUROR: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	Is there any reason, from the government's
18	perspective, that judgment should not be recorded and filed?
19	MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Any reason from the defense's perspective?
21	MR. AMBROSIO: No, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	I direct the Clerk of Court to record and file the
24	verdict.
25	Is there any reason, from the government's

23

24

25

1 perspective, why the jury should not now be dismissed? 2 MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: From the defense's perspective? 4 MR. AMBROSIO: No. 5 THE COURT: Okay. The jury will be dismissed. Members of the jury, this concludes your duty. 6 7 A much esteemed judge of this court would never comment on a jury's verdict, nor would he thank the jurors for 8 9 their service. It was that judge's view - Judge Weinfeld, a 10 very esteemed member of this bench - not to thank the jury for 11 performing what is their civic duty, one of the highest and 12 most important duties of citizenship. 13 I'm going to follow that practice, in part. I will 14 not comment on your verdict. I will note, however, the 15 attention that you each paid to this case, the diligence and 16 care that you exercised, and the sacrifice that many, if not 17 all, of you made in performing your jury duty in this case. 18 For that, I thank you, on the part of our nation. 19 You are now dismissed. You should leave your notes in 20 the jury room. My courtroom deputy will ensure that they are 21 destroyed. 22 You're no longer under my injunction not to speak

You're no longer under my injunction not to speak about the case. You're free to talk about the case or not talk about the case, as you see fit.

I would, however, note one thing for you to think

about: You might want to think about whether, if you do talk about the case, you should just talk about your own views. No one signs up for jury duty with the expectation that other jurors will comment upon what he or she said in the jury room. That's not an instruction to you — I'm done giving instructions to you — that's just one thing you should keep in mind.

Another way of putting it is the Golden Rule — that you might think about not saying about others what you wouldn't want them to say about you.

It may be that people approach you to talk about the case. Again, you're free to talk about it, or not talk about it, as you see fit. If any of the parties in this case try to talk to you about the case, you also are free to talk to them or not talk to them, as you see fit. However, if you do not wish to speak to any of the parties in this case, and that party persists in trying to talk to you, I would tell you to bring it to my courtroom deputy's attention, and we will take care of that.

So, with that, and expressing to you again the thanks of our nation, you're now dismissed.

We'll all stand for you one last time. Take your belongings. Leave your notes in the jury room.

All rise.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: Be seated.

```
1
               All right. Any posttrial motions will be due on the
2
      date set by the Federal Rules following the date of the
 3
      verdict.
 4
               Is there anything else from the government that we
 5
      should address today?
 6
               MR. FIDDELMAN: Does the Court prefer to set a
7
      sentencing date at this time?
8
               THE COURT: I do.
 9
               So, what I have in mind is March 6, 2025, at
      11:00 a.m.
10
11
               Does that work for the defense?
12
               MR. AMBROSIO: Give me one second, your Honor.
13
               (Pause)
14
               MR. AMBROSIO: March 6th, your Honor?
15
               THE COURT: Yes.
16
               MR. AMBROSIO: Yes, I'm available.
17
               THE COURT: Okay.
18
               So, sentencing will be March 6, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.
19
               I'm going to direct the government to provide its
20
      statement of facts to probation by -- can you do it by
21
      December 2nd of 2024?
22
               MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Mr. Ambrosio, can you arrange by
24
      December 9th to make your client available for an interview by
25
      probation?
```

MR. AMBROSIO: Yes, Judge. And, for the record, I want to be present.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I will order, first, that by December 9th you make arrangements to have your client interviewed by probation.

I am also going to order that there be no interview of Mr. Colon without counsel being present.

Let me advise you, Mr. Colon, that the probation department will want to interview you in connection with the presentence report that it will prepare. It's very important that you be accurate with them if you decide to speak with them. The presentence report is something that I will read and pay close attention to at the time of sentencing.

I will also advise you that you are going to have the right to review and to comment on the presentence report, and so it's very important that when you get a copy of the presentence report, you review it carefully, and that you go over with counsel any errors in the presentence report or anything else that you believe should be brought to my attention.

The parties should consult my individual practices with respect to sentencing submissions. Those practices provide that defense submissions are due two weeks before sentencing, and the government's submissions are due one week in advance of sentencing.

1 I don't have any page limits in connection with 2 sentencing, so feel free to bring anything to my attention that 3 you believe deserves attention. Is there anything else, from the government's 4 5 perspective? What's the defendant's situation on bail? 6 MR. FIDDELMAN: The defendant is currently out on a 7 personal recognizance bond, with conditions of supervision. And the government has no objection to continuing those same 8 9 conditions pending sentencing. 10 THE COURT: Okay. The conditions as set will be 11 maintained. 12 Mr. Colon, let me advise you that the prior conditions 13 of bail that have been set for you continue. 14 Do you understand that? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And, sir, you must be in this courtroom on 17 the date and at the time set for sentencing. If you are not 18 here on that date and at that time, you will be guilty of a 19 separate crime, that of bail-jumping. 20 Do you understand that? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Is there anything else from the 23 government's perspective? 2.4 MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Colon, you may be seated.

```
OBMKCOL2
               Mr. Ambrosio, anything else from your perspective?
1
 2
               MR. AMBROSIO: No.
 3
               THE COURT: It was very well tried case. I think
 4
      that's it for the day.
 5
               Have a good afternoon, everybody. Thank you.
                (Adjourned)
 6
7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```